

## **UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT**

## NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

## FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT BRANCH

Washington, D.C. 20570

Via email

March 7, 2023

Re: FOIA Request NLRB-2023-000849

Dear Dr. Andrew D. Chapman:

This is in response to your request, under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, received on February 17, 2023, in which you seek the "Signed Charge Against Employer, Initial Letter to Charged Party, Initial Letter to Charging Party, Conformed Settlement Agreement Bilateral, Notice to Employees, Certification of Posting, and four Certificates of Compliance-Charged Party," in *Eldora Mountain Resort*, Case No. 27-CA-306265. You assumed financial responsibility for the processing of your request in the amount of \$37.00. You requested expedited processing and a waiver of fees.

We acknowledged your request on February 17, 2023. On February 21, 2023, your request for expedited processing was denied for the reasons explained in FOIAonline.

A search of the Agency's electronic casehandling system, NxGen, has been conducted. This search has located 20 pages of responsive, releasable records from the requested case file, which are attached. Regarding the requested Certificates of Compliance, please note that there is one only one Certificate of Compliance, and one is actually a Supplemental Certificate of Compliance. The case page on the Agency's website had apparently incorrectly listed four Certificates, listing these two documents twice, but it has since been corrected.

After a review, I have determined that portions of the attached records are exempt from disclosure under Exemptions 6 and 7(C) of the FOIA (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)). Specifically, redactions have been made to protect the privacy interests of individuals named in the records. These redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C).

However, four pages that were attached to the Certificates of Compliance are withheld pursuant to Exemption 6 and 7(C), as they contain personal information which warrants full protection under FOIA Exemptions 6 and 7(C) since their disclosure could constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

Exemption 6 permits agencies to withhold information about individuals in "personnel and medical and similar files" where the disclosure of the information "would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6). Am. Immigration Lawyers Ass'n v. Exec. Office for Immigration Review, 830 F.3d 667, 673 (D.C. Cir. 2016). The "files" requirement covers all information that "applies to a particular individual." Ayuda, Inc. v. FTC, 70 F.Supp.3d 247,264 (D.D.C. 2014) (citing *U.S. Dep't of State v. Wash. Post Co.*, 456 U.S. 595, 601-02 (1982)). "Similar files' has been interpreted broadly to include '[q]overnment records on an individual which can be identified as applying to that individual." Pavement Coatings Technology Council v. United States Geological Survey, 2019 WL 7037527, \*8 (D.D.C. Dec. 19, 2019) (quoting Wash. Post Co., 456 at 602). See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA, 449 F.3d 141, 198-199 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (Exemption 6 may exempt not just files, but personal information such as names and addresses). Exemption 7(C) permits agencies to withhold information compiled for law enforcement purposes where disclosure of the information "could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(7)(C); U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749, 756 (1989), see also Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law v. DOJ, 2020 WL 1189091, \*3-4, (D.D.C. Mar. 12, 2020) (reaffirming that Exemption 7(C) imposes a "lower bar for withholding" than Exemption 6,).

Application of Exemptions 6 and 7(C) requires a two-part balancing test that considers: (1) whether there is a legitimate personal privacy interest in the requested information, and, if so; (2) whether there is a countervailing public interest in disclosure that outweighs the privacy interest. Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Nat'l Archives & Records Admin., 214 F. Supp. 3d 43, 58 (D.D.C. 2016), aff'd, 876 F.3d 346 (D.C. Cir. 2017), citing Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish, 541 U.S. 157, 171 (2004). With respect to the first factor, the Supreme Court has described Exemptions 6 and 7(C) as reflecting privacy interests in "avoiding disclosure of personal matters," Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 762, maintaining the "individual's control of information concerning his or her person," id. at 763, avoiding "disclosure of records containing personal details about private citizens," id. at 766, and "keeping personal facts away from the public eye," id. at 769. Consistent with these concerns, privacy interests have been recognized for individuals named in a law enforcement investigation, including third parties mentioned in investigatory files, as well as witnesses and informants who provide information during the course of an investigation. See Rugiero v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 257 F.3d 534, 552 (6th Cir. 2001); Nation Magazine v. U.S. Customs

Serv., 71 F.3d 885, 894 (D.C. Cir. 1995); and Van Bourg, Allen, Weinberg & Roger v. NLRB, 751 F.2d 982, 985 (9th Cir. 1985).

The withheld records are exempt from disclosure under the above balancing test. They are investigative files created or obtained by the Agency for the purpose of enforcing the National Labor Relations Act, and contain individuals' names, addresses, and other identifying information that fit squarely within the types of privacy interests that Exemptions 6 and 7(C) were intended to protect from disclosure. By contrast, I perceive no countervailing public interest in disclosure. The public's interest in disclosure depends on "the extent to which disclosure would serve the 'core purpose of the FOIA,' which is 'contribut[ing] significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government." U.S. Dep't of Def. v. Fed. Labor Relations Auth., 510 U.S. 487, 495 (1994) (emphasis in original), quoting Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 775. As the Supreme Court further explained in Nat'l Archives & Records Admin., 541 U.S. at 172, to defeat a privacy interest there must be some indication that the "public interest sought to be advanced is a significant one, an interest more specific than having the information for its own sake . . . [and that] the information is likely to advance that interest." No such public interest is evident here that outweighs the private interests identified above. For the foregoing reasons, the records are protected from disclosure under Exemptions 6 and 7(C).

For the purpose of assessing fees, we have placed you in Category D, the "all other requesters" category, because you do not fall within any of the other fee categories. Consistent with this fee category, you will be assessed charges to recover the reasonable direct costs for searching for the requested records, except that you will not be charged for the first two hours of search. NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(ii)(D). Charges for all categories of requesters are \$9.25 per quarter hour of professional time. 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(i).

Less than two hours of professional time was expended in searching for the requested material. Accordingly, there is no charge for this request. Given that there is no charge for this request, your request for a fee waiver is moot.

You may contact Joseph Mullaney, the Attorney-Advisor who processed your request, at (202) 273-3863 or by email at Joseph.Mullaney@nlrb.gov, as well as the Agency's FOIA Public Liaison, for any further assistance and/or to discuss any aspect of your request. The FOIA Public Liaison, in addition to the Attorney-Advisor, can further explain responsive and releasable agency records, suggest agency offices that may have responsive records, and/or discuss how to narrow the scope of a request in order to minimize fees and processing times. The contact information for the Agency's FOIA Public Liaison is:

Kristine M. Minami, FOIA Public Liaison National Labor Relations Board 1015 Half Street, S.E., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Washington, D.C. 20570 Email: FOIAPublicLiaison@nlrb.gov

Telephone: (202) 273-0902 Fax: (202) 273-FOIA (3642)

After first contacting the Agency, you may additionally contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA dispute resolution services it offers. The contact information for OGIS is:

Office of Government Information Services National Archives and Records Administration 8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS College Park, Maryland 20740-6001 Email: ogis@nara.gov

Telephone: (202) 741-5770 Toll free: (877) 684-6448 Fax: (202) 741-5769

You may obtain a review of this determination under the NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(c)(2)(v), by filing an administrative appeal with the Division of Legal Counsel (DLC) through FOIAonline at: https://foiaonline.gov/foiaonline/action/public/home or by mail or email at:

Nancy E. Kessler Platt, Chief FOIA Officer National Labor Relations Board 1015 Half Street, S.E., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Washington, D.C. 20570 Email: DLCFOIAAppeal@nlrb.gov

Any appeal must be postmarked or electronically submitted within 90 calendar days of the date of this letter. Any appeal should contain a complete statement of the reasons upon which it is based.

Please be advised that contacting any Agency official (including the Attorney-Advisor, FOIA Officer, or the FOIA Public Liaison) and/or OGIS does not stop the 90-day appeal clock and is not an alternative or substitute for filing an administrative appeal.

Sincerely,

ISI Synta E. Keeling

Synta E. Keeling FOIA Officer

Attachment: (20 pages)